

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested on the basis of the following particulars:

Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment

In response to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment mailed on January 1, 2006, Applicant notes that the papers filed on November 21, 2005 are a response to another unrelated application that appears to have been erroneously entered into the present application as a result of a typographical error whereby the application number that appears on the papers is incorrect. Applicant further notes that, referring to the transmittal form and the first page of the papers filed on November 21, 2005, the inventor name, the examiner's name, the art unit, and the title of the invention do not match the present application. Further it is noted that these papers, which state that they are "timely filed in response to the Office Action dated August 23, 2005," were received prior to the mailing of the first Office Action in the present application.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the papers filed on November 21, 2005 are clearly not related to the present application and are clearly the result of a typographical error contained in these papers, and not the result of any action of the Applicant or Applicant's representative.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the present submission, responsive to the Action dated November 28, 2005 in the present application, is sufficiently responsive to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment mailed on January 1, 2006.

Additionally, it is respectfully requested that the papers filed on November 21, 2005 be removed from the present application file.

Telephonic interview with the Examiner

Applicant's representative conducted a telephonic interview with the examiner on February 24, 2006. During the course of the interview, Applicant's representative and the examiner discussed the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment, the drawing objection, and the indication of allowable subject matter made in the Office Action of November 28, 2005.

It was determined that the drawing objection would be overcome by amending the claims to recite the driver port separately from the USB hub in a manner consistent with Fig. 2.

Applicant's representative noted that, while the original claims recite "a connection port connected to a tablet computer," it is clear from the specification that the tablet computer is removable from the base. Thus, it was agreed that a recitation of "a connection port configured for connection to a tablet computer" would not deviate from the indicated allowable subject matter. Additionally, it was agreed that the limitations of the power supply relating to converting AC to DC power are not essentially related to the patentable subject matter, and therefore may be removed.

In the specification

The specification has been amended in the interest of improved consistency with the drawings and the amended claims. It is respectfully submitted that the amended specification is consistent with the original drawings, and therefore no new matter is entered.

Objection to the drawings

The drawings have been objected to as not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. It is respectfully submitted that amendments of the claims obviate this objection, and therefore withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 1-7 presently stand rejected as being indefinite. In particular, the examiner notes the recitation of “enabling a computer” and states that Applicant needs to specify whether this computer is the same computer as the tablet computer recited in the preamble.

The claims have been amended to recite “a second computer” to distinguish from the “tablet computer.” However, Applicant notes that while “a second computer” is recited, the claims require no “first computer” or tablet computer since, while claim 1 recites a connection port that is “configured *for connection to* a tablet computer,” the tablet computer is removable from the base.

Rejection of claims 1, 2, and 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a); Allowable subject matter

Claims 1, 2, and 5-7 presently stand rejected as being unpatentable over the article “Putting Pen to Tablet” by Rebecca Freed in view of USB specification 2.0 and Nolan et al (U.S. 6,728,734). However, the examiner has indicated that claims 3 and 4 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The examiner’s indication of allowable subject matter is noted with appreciation. In this regard, Applicant has rewritten claim 1 to incorporate allowable subject matter from claim 3 along with limitations of the intervening claim 2, based on the examiner’s statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter.

In rewriting claim 1 to incorporate allowable subject matter of claim 3, including limitations of the intervening claim 2, Applicant has further amended the claim in the interest of clarity and consistency.

Where claim 2 originally introduces additional limitations of the USB hub with the phrase “wherein said USB hub *consists* a controller [...],” the amended claim introduces these limitations with the phrase “said USB hub *further comprising* a controller [...].” Applicant notes that the original claim 1 introduces the USB hub with the open-ended term “contains” (now “comprising”), and submits that having introduced the USB hub in

an open-ended form the further recitation “further comprising” is more consistent and does not enlarge the scope of the claim because the USB hub is already introduced in an open-ended form.

Similarly, where claim 3 originally set forth additional limitations of the base with the phrase “wherein said base further *consists* a logic controller [...],” Applicant notes that the preamble of the original claim recites “an independent base of a tablet computer *comprising*” the elements further recited in the claim. Again, the subsequent reference to the “base consists” is inconsistent with the original recitation of “comprising.” Accordingly, claim 1 has been amended to eliminate the language of the original claim 3 reciting “wherein said base further *consists* a logic controller [...],” and instead to simply recite the additional limitations set forth in the original claim 3.

During the course of the telephone interview discussed above, it was agreed that the preamble could be rewritten to recite “an independent base *for* a tablet computer comprising” instead of “an independent base *of* a tablet computer comprising” since it is clear from the specification and the drawings, as well as portions of the original claims, that the tablet computer is intended to be removable from the independent base.

Similarly, it was agreed during the course of the telephone interview that the phrase “a connection port *connected to* a tablet computer,” recited in the original claim 3, could be rewritten as “a connection port *configured for connection to* a tablet computer,” again because it is clear from the specification and the drawings that the tablet computer is intended to be removable from the independent base.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments to the claims, and in further view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is requested that claims 1 and 4-7 be allowed and the application be passed to issue.


Application No.: 10/754,722
Examiner: J. King
Art Unit: 2111

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the Applicant's attorney, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176
Phone: (703) 683-0500

Date: February 27, 2006

Respectfully submitted,


JOHN R. SCHAEFER
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 47,921